



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

there are many answers. Plautus cared nothing at all about such matters. His indifference to matters of art everybody knows; if illustration of it must be had, see e.g., my remarks in *Classical Philology*, II, 14, note 1, II, 6, note 1. Further, after 880-81, *Stalagmum meum qui gnatum surrupuit?* the only possible subject of the verb *venit* in 882, as read by Niemeyer, is, not Philocrates at all, but *Stalagmus*. Between Philopolemus and his father's thoughts two other personalities have come—*Stalagmus* and the boy lost twenty years before. *Iam hodie <Stalagmus venit>*, “Has *Stalagmus* come back so soon?” is wildly absurd. To the father's heart the twenty years of *Stalagmus'* absence had been a long, long time (compare the implications of the prologue and of 759 ff.). There is also a grievous psychological flaw in Niemeyer's text and introduction. Plautus knew humanity, if he did disregard art; he knew too well the soul of a father bereft to make him think, when face to face with a great and unexpected joy, the recovery of a long-lost son, of the trifling and irrelevant question of the possibility or impossibility of making a given journey in a given time.

It is, moreover, entirely possible to keep the manuscript reading. Professor Elmer nearly saw the truth. He gave the traditional text, but had the acumen to connect *iam diu* with the preceding *surrupuit*. Let us bring this out by proper punctuation, by putting a dash after *surrupuit*, instead of a question mark; Ergasilus cuts in while Hegio is speaking. The effectiveness of the passage could be brought out far more easily in acting than on the printed page. What Niemeyer has to say about the *Schurapparat* applies equally well to the manuscript text, as just interpreted.

On 912 A (912 B in Niemeyer), which is given only in A, in a sadly corrupt state, Lindsay, *editio maior*, remarks that Studemund showed that in this part of the *Captivi* A had many more verses, perhaps forty more than appear here in the other manuscripts. In 911 ff. Niemeyer inserts two whole verses; in 912 (912 B in his numbering) he inserts several words, making the verse readable. In 912 B his text strikes me as unhappy, in that it produces a very ineffective *hysteron proteron*. The insertion of verses to fill up the gap in A in this part of the play is an entertaining exercise for those who like that sort of thing, but the results are not likely to carry conviction to others. If anyone doubts this, let him compare the readings of Cap. 907, before the Ambrosian palimpsest was clearly deciphered here, with the text of that verse as now given in all the editions!! See Halle die *ad loc.*

CHARLES KNAPP

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Études sur le style des Discours de Cicéron. Avec une esquisse de l'histoire du “Cursus.” Par L. LAURAND. Paris: Hachette. Pp. xxxix+388. Fr. 7.50.

In the first of the three books into which this work is divided the author examines the language of Cicero's speeches; in the second, his use of clausulae;

and in the third, the different types of oratorical style. He has evidently made a careful study of Cicero's rhetorical treatises, especially of the *Orator*, and in his analysis of the speeches compares practice with theory, repeatedly demonstrating how Cicero, in some point of style or choice of diction, has adhered strictly to principles expounded in his rhetorical writings.

While the work is based on an original investigation of the speeches themselves, Laurand has made himself familiar with the results of the innumerable monographs and articles that have been published on various phases of the subject. He examines conflicting views with a nice discrimination. He is fair in judging other men's work, and for the most part his decisions are sound. The range of his studies may be inferred from the elaborate bibliographies (more than thirty pages in all) with which the volume is equipped. Where he has not been able to get any of the books or articles listed, he says so. This fact in itself makes his bibliography unique.

The Introduction discusses the question whether the form of the orations when published adhered to or differed from the form in which they were originally delivered. Laurand believes (p. 12) that there was, for the most part, but little change. He denies the story related by Dion Cassius,¹ and regards the changes that undoubtedly were made in the *Pro Milone* before publication as exceptional. His reasons for rejecting Dion's story are sound, but it is extremely doubtful whether the modifications in the *Pro Milone* constitute a unique case. They are probably exceptional in their extent, rather than in their kind. Laurand does not establish his point here. He does not of course dispute the fact that most of the speeches were written after delivery.

In chap. i the author speaks of the care which Cicero exercised in the choice of the words used by him in the orations. To demonstrate the purity of the orator's vocabulary, he gives a series of lists: one containing the words occurring in quotations made by Cicero, but not used by him in his own speeches; another giving the words used in his poems, but not in his speeches; and others comparing the vocabularies of the letters and the rhetorical writings with that of the orations. These lists are carefully compiled, and will be found useful in some forms of lexical study, but they only bear upon the question of Cicero's discrimination in the choice of vocabulary in a general way. They do not prove anything except that Cicero recognized the fact that different departments of literature have to a certain extent their own vocabularies; and this point is too patent to require so elaborate an array of evidence.

The second book deals with the quality of *numerus*, under which term are included all those elements which are intended to contribute to harmony of speech. In the section on alliteration (p. 113) it is shown that Cicero,

¹ *Hist. Rom.* xlvi. 7. 3, where Calenus addressing Cicero in bitter invective in the Senate says: ή οτε τινὰ ἀγνοεῖν δτι μηδέντα τῶν θαυμαστῶν σου τούτων λόγων οὐς ἐκδέδωκας εἴρηκας ἀλλὰ πάντας αὐτούς μετὰ ταῦτα συγγέγραφας.

realizing that he had used this device too frequently in his early days, employed it but rarely in the period of his best speeches. In regard to hiatus Laurand points out that there is no inconsistency between Cicero's theory as set forth in *Orator* xliv. 150, in which he urges the avoidance of hiatus, and his practice as exemplified by such passages as *De Imperio Pompei* 51, where in the course of eight lines there are thirteen examples of a final followed by an initial vowel. For it was the orator's custom to blend the sounds of the two vowels (*vocales coniungere*). He did this in delivering an oration as regularly as in reading a poem. But the chief element in oratorical harmony was the clausula, and Laurand's discussion of this constitutes the most important part of his book (pp. 143-218). He shows that Cicero's use of clausulae accords with the principles laid down in the *Orator*. He does not set forth any new theories, but by his analysis and criticism of the work of Zielinski and others succeeds in bringing out forcibly the elements of truth that lie at the base of all the theories proposed. The treatment, which is characterized throughout by a sound common-sense not often found in discussions of this question, is easily the best introduction to the study of clausulae that we have.

The third book, which deals with the different kinds of style, is inferior to the other two; the material collected is less important and the treatment is sketchy.

G. J. LAING

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Das Plagiat in der griechischen Literatur. Von DR. EDWARD STEMPFLINGER. Preisgekrönt von der Kgl. Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München (März, 1911). Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1912. Pp. vi+293.

The book was written, as we may say, to order; that is to say, to obtain the prize offered by the Munich Academy for a treatise on the following theme: "Plagiarism in Greek literature, investigated with regard to philological research, rhetorical and aesthetic theory, and the literary practice of antiquity." Agreeably to instructions the successful treatise falls into three parts: I, Ancient Philological Research Relative to Plagiarism; II, Rhetorical and Aesthetic Theories Respecting Plagiarism; III, Ancient Literary Practice.

Part I treats (1) of the sources of the literature dealing with *κλοπαί*, discussing in some detail the contributions of commentaries on individual authors, of books dealing with *ενρύματα*, of personal polemic, of scholia and compilations, and of pseudepigraphic literature; (2) of the treatises *περὶ κλοπῆς*, whether referring to special authors or having a general scope, giving the texts of the well-known sections of Porphyry and Clement of Alexandria, and considering them with reference to their sources and their classifications. Part II discusses (1) the development of literary technique,